

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action & Amendments

Claims 2-26 have been examined. By this Amendment, Applicant is amending claim 16 according to the Examiner's suggestion during a telephone conference on June 29, 2009. During the telephone conference, the Examiner proposed amending claim 16 to define the source signals as video signals. By doing so, the Examiner indicated that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Goodman (US 6,192,399) and Fenouil (US 6,240,554) would be withdrawn and an allowance would be issued. Although the present Office Action issued after the June 29 discussion, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter and reconsider this amendment to claim 16 for determining patentability. Since the Examiner has already considered this amendment prior to issuing the present Office Action, Applicant believes no additional search and/or consideration is required regarding the claim amendment. Thus, Applicant requests entry of the amendment as it does not raise new issues.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman (US 6,192,399) in view of Fenouil (US 6,240,554).

Claim 16 has been amended to recite that "each of the source signals is a video signal." As noted above, the Examiner indicated in a telephone conversation on June 29, 2009 that the claims would be patentably distinct over the combination of Goodman and Fenouil if the source signals were defined as video signals.

For example, the Examiner indicated in the June 29 conversation that, according to column 11, line 18 to column 12, line 54 and Figure 12 of Fenouil, Fenouil teaches that "the up signals and the down signals are carried separately by the service pair and the distribution pair,

respectively,” **only when the source signals are audio signals.** *See also* page 6, lines 1-5 and 18-22, of the present Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Goodman, alone or in combination with Fenouil, does not teach or suggest that “the service pair carries up signals, the up signals being the sources signals derived from the sources and the control signals; wherein the distribution pair carries down signals, the down signals being the multiplexed processed signals; the up signals and the down signals are carried separately by the service pair and the distribution pair, respectively; and **each of the source signals is a video signal,**” as recited in claim 16. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable for at least this reason.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-15 and 17-26 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U. S. Application No.: 10/529,153

Attorney Docket No.: Q87053

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan F. Heavener/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 22, 2009

Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512